

App. No.: 09/681430
Filed: April 3, 2001
Conf. No.: 4775

Page 7 of 7

REMARKS

The Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 1-26 is noted with appreciation. In response to her rejection of claims 27-35 it is proposed to amend independent claim 27 to include the limitations of claim 28, more clearly stated and to overcome her technical rejection, which is well taken.

Referring first to her objections to the drawings, she is most respectfully requested to reconsider her objections as it is believed that the features she has mentioned are in fact illustrated. As to the plane bearing it is shown in several of the figures. For example it is shown in FIG. 3 where it is identified by the reference numeral 42.

As to the detachable post it is shown in several figures, for example FIG. 3. As seen in this figure the end closure 36 has a boss 37 that receives the shaft or post 38.


If, however, the Examiner has some suggestion how these illustrations could be improved, applicant would appreciate her suggestion.

Referring now to the art rejection, as noted above it is proposed to amend claim 27 to include the limitations of claim 28, which would then be cancelled and other claims amended where necessary to reflect this amendment.

The Examiner's reliance on Shimizu is well taken. However the projection of his end wall that supports the bearing 28 is very short and the bulk of the load must be carried by the large bearing 29 at the opposite end. Also this requires an expensive anti-friction bearing such as the illustrated ball bearings. Thus applicant's construction provides a large bearing area that makes the use of a lower cost plane bearing possible.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that entry of this amendment will place this case in condition for favorable action and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted:


Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717
4821 Pacific Time